REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 11, 13, 19 and 28 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the following remarks.

Claim 28 has been objected to by the Examiner because the acronym CDMA was not defined. Claim 28 has, therefore, been amended to define the acronym according to the Examiner's recommendation. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection to claim 28 is moot in light of the amendment.

Claims 4 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. Claims 4 and 11 have been amended to provide proper antecedent bases. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claims 4 and 11 comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claims 1-17, 19-27 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Gerhards et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0012312, hereinafter "Gerhards"); claims 18, 28 and 29 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerhards; and claims 32, 33 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gerhards in view of Neufeld et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0067762, hereinafter "Neufeld"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, "generating a group of hypotheses from the sets of search parameters, after reading the sets of search parameters." Gerhards does not teach or suggest this limitation. As shown in Figures 3A-3B, Gerhards discloses transferring an individual set of search parameters, starting the searcher hardware (Blocks 102 and 118), and

processing the search results (Blocks 106, 108, 110 and 112). According to Gerhards, the reading, searching and processing proceed in a loopwise manner. (Gerhards, paragraph [0060]). Gerhards does not teach or suggest reading "sets" of search parameters, in fact, Gerhards does not disclose reading more than one set of search parameters in an attempted acquisition. Rather, whenever a new set of search parameters are needed, processor 76 puts "new search parameters in the batch buffer" and starts search 24. (Gerhards, paragraph [0060]). Claim 1, on the other hand, requires generating a group of hypotheses from the sets of search parameters, after reading the sets of search parameters. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 2-12 and 31-37 depend from claim 1 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 13 has been amended to recite, "a memory to store a plurality of sets of search parameters and search results, wherein each set of search parameters is assigned a common reference number, and a corresponding set of search results for each set of search parameters is stored with the same common reference number." The Final Office Action states that "Gerhards discloses ... a set of search results for a set of search parameters is stored with the same reference number ([0060] and [0058]), *associated index*)." (Final Office Action, page 6; emphasis in original). Gerhards teaches that each individual correlation value is indexed with a correlation result, and that the maximum correlation result and its associated index are transferred to search buffer 68. (Gerhards, paragraph [0058]). Gerhards, however, does not teach a plurality of sets of search parameters, and is silent on how the indexing of the search parameters corresponds with the indexing of the search results. Gerhards is silent on the

dimensionality, identity, and indexing and assignment scheme of the search parameters. Gerhards, therefore, cannot teach a common reference number. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 14-18 depend from claim 13 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Claim 19 has been amended to recite, "a processing unit coupled to the ADC, the processing unit containing circuitry to store together a plurality of dependent sets of search parameters, search results, and test hypotheses derived from the sets of search parameters." The Response to Arguments section of the Final Office Action states that

> Applicants have submitted that Gerhalds fails to teach of a processing unit containing circuitry <u>store together dependent sets</u> of search parameters as required by Claim 19. Examiner submits that the processor (#76) outputs the sets of search parameters which are stored in the same memory (batch buffer) ([0060]).

(Final Office Action, page 16; emphasis in original).

As is discussed hereinabove with respect to claim 1 hereinabove, Gerhards discloses reading, searching and processing proceeds in a loopwise manner. (Gerhards, paragraph [0060]). When new set of search parameters are needed, processor 76 puts "new search parameters in the batch buffer" and starts search 24. (Gerhards, paragraph [0060]). Furthermore, Gerhards teaches "a batch buffer 66 for holding variables which are to be transmitted from the microprocessor 22 to the controller 26." (Gerhards, paragraph [0048]). Gerhards, however, does not teach or suggest that search results and test hypotheses derived from the sets of search parameters are also stored in batch buffer 66. Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 19 is allowable over the prior art of record.

Claims 20-30 depend from claim 19 and add further limitations. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims are allowable by reason of depending from an allowable claim as well as for adding new limitations.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Ronald O. Neerings, Applicant's attorney, at 972-917-5299 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible. No fee is believed due in connection with this filing. However, should one be deemed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge, or credit any overpayment, Deposit Account No. 20-0668.

Respectfully submitted,

_____June 19, 2008_____   _____/Benjamin E. Nise/_____
Date   Benjamin E. Nise
                                                Agent for Applicant
                                                Reg. No. 55,500

SLATER & MATSIL, L.L.P.
17950 Preston Rd., Suite 1000
Dallas, Texas 75252
Tel.: 972-732-1001
Fax: 972-732-9218